

REMARKS

This is in response to the Final Office Action mailed December 29, 2009, in which the Examiner rejected pending claims 1-8 and 14-21, and identified claims 9-13 as being withdrawn. Reconsideration of the application and the withdrawal of the finality of the rejections are respectfully requested.

Interview Summary

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the courtesy of discussing the above-identified application via telephone with Applicant's representative, Brian D. Kaul, on March 1, 2010. During the interview, Applicant requested the identification of elements of independent claims 1 and 14 in the cited references. The Examiner identified the claimed "destination column objects" as reading on item 10 in FIG. 4 of Gorelik and the claimed "destination column" as reading on the "LineItems" column of FIG. 4 of Gorelik. The Examiner explained that the nested table of FIG. 4 corresponds to the claimed "reporter table".

Applicant explained that the primary distinction between the embodiments of the invention described in claims 1 and 14 and the cited references is that the cited references discuss the use of an Extraction, Transformation and Loading (ETL) systems that perform operations using ETL packages, whereas the claimed embodiments of the invention describe systems and methods for configuring (i.e., designing) ETL packages. Applicant further explained that this objective of the embodiments of the invention is clearly identified and claimed. For instance, the method of claim 14 is directed to "a method of configuring an Extraction, Transformation and Loading (ETL) package . . ." and includes "generating instructions for configuring an ETL package, responsive to executing the ETL designer module."

The Examiner indicated that the interview clarified this distinction between the claimed invention and the cited references. The Examiner recommended that Applicant provide a response to the final Office Action. Further, the Examiner indicated that a thorough response (i.e., not a cursory Advisory Action) could be expected by Applicant.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C §103

In Section 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected pending claims 1-5, 8 and 14-21 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over MaGuire (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0059651) in view of Gorelik (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2001/0047372). The rejections should be withdrawn for the reasons set forth below.

In rejecting independent claims 1 and 14, the Examiner found Gorelik to disclose an ETL designer module. In particular, the Examiner found the destination column class and association class of the ETL designer module described in claims 1 and 14 to read on the “XFRORM RULES (Declarative Rules)” 210 of FIG. 6B. There is no support for this finding.

In particular, Gorelik fails to disclose that the rules 210 include “a destination column class defining destination column objects each identifying a destination column of the reporter table” or “an association class defining association objects each identifying an association of at least one source column of the financial table with a destination column identified by a corresponding destination column object,” as recited in independent claims 1 and 14. In fact, Applicant was not able to locate any discussion of the rules 210 in Gorelik. Thus, there is no support for the Examiner’s finding.

In response to this argument, the Examiner states that the Abstract of Gorelik discloses that “The system can specify and execute declarative rules to extract, transform, integrate, load and update hierarchical and relational data.” The Examiner then concludes that , “[i]n combination the illustration in fig. 6B depicts these rules mentioned in the abstract. Therefore, the defining destination column objects and defining association objects is understood to be broadly met by the image, therefore the Examiner respectfully disagrees.”

Thus, the Examiner’s contention appears to be one based on inherency. That is, the elements of claims 1 and 14 must necessarily be found in the rules 210. However, the Examiner provides no basis as to why the rules 210 must necessarily include the cited elements of claims 1 an 14. Such a conclusory finding cannot support a *prima facie* case of obviousness.

Applicant also disagrees with the Examiner’s finding that the transformation engine 114 (FIG. 6A) of Gorelik discloses “a transformation class defining transformation objects each

responsible for a transformation of the source data elements of the source column into a reporter format of the associated destination column as identified by a corresponding association object,” as provided in claims 1 and 14. In particular, the cited transformation engine 114 is not described by Gorelik as defining the particular transformation objects recited in claims 1 and 14. Thus, there is no support for the Examiner’s finding.

In response to this argument, the Examiner states that “[h]owever, the transformation engine 114 is defined as performing transformations in [0042] and in combination with MaGuire, the elements in the claim are understood to be broadly met by the references in combination. Therefore, the Examiner respectfully disagrees.”

Again, the Examiner appears to contend that the elements of the claims are inherently disclosed by the transformation engine 114. However, the Examiner has provided no evidence that the cited transformation engine 114 must necessarily include the transformation class of claims 1 and 14, having the specific limitations described in the claims. That is, even if the cited transformation engine 114 performs transformations, there is no basis for the Examiner’s finding that it includes the specific limitations described in claim 14. For instance, one cannot determine that the transformation engine 114 of Gorelik defines transformation objects each responsible for a transformation of the source data elements of the source column of the cited financial table of MaGuire into a reporter format of the associated destination column of the cited reporter table of MaGuire as identified by the corresponding association object (yet to be identified) of FIG. 4 of Gorelik. The conclusory finding of the Examiner cannot support a *prima facie* case of obviousness against the claims.

Applicant also disagrees with the Examiner’s finding that FIG. 6 of Gorelik, “depicts instructions for configuring” and discloses “generating instructions for configuring an ETL package, responsive to executing the ETL designer module,” as provided in claim 14. In particular, Applicant cannot discern where in FIG. 6 the recited method step is disclosed. There does not appear to be any support for the Examiner’s finding. As discussed previously, Gorelik fails to disclose any manner in which the ETL packages are formed in the ETL system mentioned in paragraph [0006] of Gorelik.

In response, the Examiner states that “paragraph [0006] [of Gorelik] explicitly mentions an ETL system, therefore the Examiner respectfully disagrees.” However, as discussed previously, the mere recitation of the existence of an ETL system that uses ETL packages, is not sufficient to provide support for the disclosure of a system or method that configures ETL packages for use in ETL systems, as provided in claims 1 and 14.

Accordingly, the cited references do not disclose “an ETL designer module stored on the tangible computer-readable medium, executable by the processor, and designed to configure the ETL package,” as provided in claim 1, or “generating instructions for configuring an ETL package, responsive to executing the ETL designer module,” as provided in claim 14. Therefore, the references, taken either alone or in combination, fail to disclose the system of claim 1 or the method of claim 14.

For at least the above reasons, a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established against independent claims 1 and 14. Therefore, Applicant requests that the rejections be withdrawn.

Additionally, claims 2-4, 8 and 15-21 are non-obvious in view of the cited references at least for the reasons set forth above with regard to either claim 1 or 14, from which they depend. Therefore, Applicant requests that the rejections be withdrawn. This does not constitute acquiescence of the Examiner’s findings with regard to these claims. Additional exemplary grounds for withdrawing the rejections of some of the dependent claims are provided below.

In rejecting claims 4 and 17, the Examiner found Gorelik to teach “a nested relational data model wherein the transformation includes concatenating the source data elements of two or more source columns ([0122] discusses concatenating)” Applicant disagrees with this finding for the reasons previously presented in the Response filed March 4, 2009, which was not addressed by the Examiner in either the previous or present Office Action. Accordingly, the argument is presented again below.

The concatenation discussed in paragraph [0122] of Gorelik is unrelated to a transformation of source data elements, as described in claims 4 and 17. Rather, the cited paragraph provides “[t]he AL_UNNEST operator transforms a relation into one, which is less

deeply nested by concatenating each tuple in the relation being unnested to the remaining attributes in the relation.” Thus, while a concatenating transformation is disclosed in Gorelik, it is unrelated to the transformation of source data elements of source columns of a financial table, as required by independent claims 1 and 14. Accordingly, the cited references either taken alone or in combination, fail to disclose “wherein the transformation includes a concatenation of the source data elements of two or more source columns,” as provided in claim 4, or “wherein the transformation includes concatenating the source data elements of two or more source columns,” as provided in claim 17. Therefore, claims 4 and 17 are non-obvious in view of the cited references.

With regard to claim 21, the Examiner found paragraph [0031] of MaGuire to disclose the subject matter of claim 21. Applicant respectfully disagrees with this finding for the reasons set forth in the Response filed March 4, 2009, which was not addressed by the Examiner in either the previous or present Office Action. Accordingly, the argument is presented again below.

Paragraph [0031] of MaGuire has no relation to “validating that an association object has been completed for each destination column of the reporter table prior to generating instructions for configuring an ETL package”, as provided in claim 21. Rather, the cited section of MaGuire merely relates to an analysis to determine if any rules affect the replicated entry in JP SoB 114. Therefore, claim 21 is non-obvious in view of the cited references. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

In Section 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected pending claims 6 and 7 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over MaGuire (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0059651) and Gorelik (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2001/0047372) in view of Pape (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2008/0030348). Claims 6 and 7 are non-obvious in view of the cited references at least for the reasons set forth above with regard to claim 1, from which they depend. Accordingly, the rejections should be withdrawn.

Request for Explanation of Findings

Applicant appreciates the Examiner's effort in identifying some of the specific elements of the cited references that correspond to those of the claims. Applicant also appreciates the Examiner providing more specific identification of the claimed "destination column objects" and "destination column" in the interview discussed above. However, the elements corresponding to some of the claimed elements remains unclear. For instance, Applicant cannot discern what particular elements in FIG. 4 of Gorelik correspond to the claimed "association objects" and "source column." Clarification is requested.

Additionally, the claimed elements include limitations regarding the manner in which they are interrelated with each other. However, it is not clear where these interrelations are disclosed in the references, or how the Examiner is interpreting the references to disclose the limitations. For instance, the Examiner found FIG. 4 of Gorelik to disclose the "association objects" of claim 14. However, the cited association objects of Gorelik do not appear to have any relationship to the cited financial table and reporter table of MaGuire, as required in claim 14, and no explanation has been provided regarding the finding that the claimed relationship exists between the association objects, the financial table and the reporter table. Similar issues exist with regard to other elements of the claims, such as the destination column objects, the destination column, and the transformation objects, for example.

Applicant requests that the Examiner provide a detailed explanation of the rejections including the identification of the specific elements within a cited figure that correspond to the claimed elements, unless the entire figure corresponds to the claimed element. Additionally, Applicant requests that the Examiner provide a detailed explanation justifying the findings that the claimed relationships between the elements read on the cited elements of the references. This information is essential to fully inform Applicant of the grounds for the rejections and to narrow issues for appeal.

Request for Non-Final Office Action

Applicant requests that a new non-final Office Action be issued that includes an explanation of the Examiner's findings as requested above. This is necessary in order to give Applicant a full opportunity to comprehend and respond to all of the Examiner's findings including the filing of amendments.

Conclusion

Applicant respectfully believes that the application is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and allowance of the application is respectfully requested.

The Director is authorized to charge any fee deficiency required by this paper or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 23-1123.

Respectfully submitted,

MICROSOFT CORPORATION

By: /Brian D. Kaul/

Brian D. Kaul, Reg. No. 41,885
Westman, Champlin & Kelly, P.A.
900 Second Avenue South, Suite 1400
Minneapolis, MN 55402-3244

One Microsoft Way
Redmond, Washington 98052-6399
Phone: (425) 707-9382

BDK/eap